

### Remarks

Prior to the Request for Continued Examination, claims 1-18 were pending in the application with claims 1-14 rejected and claims 15-18 withdrawn from consideration. In the amendments above, claims 1, 7, and 10 are amended, claims 2-5 and 11-18 are cancelled, and claims 19-21 are added, leaving claims 1, 6-9 (dependent on claim 1), 10, and 19-21 for examination.

The drawing objections noted by the Examiner are addressed in the accompanying replacement drawings. Specifically, Figures 20 and 22 are now included.

The pending independent claims specify additional features of the seal component of the invention that are not disclosed or suggested by the references cited in the previous Examiner's Action. Using claim 1 as an example for discussion, the limitations of now-cancelled claims 2-5 have been added to claim 1, along with additional elements to distinguish the seal of the claimed valve from that of the Inada *et al.* reference that is the only cited art of record applied against such claims. In particular, claim 1 now specifies (using applicant's numbering in *italics*) a radially inwardly directed sealing shoulder *100* for sealable seating against the second poppet *30* when the second poppet is biased into the aperture by the second spring *34*. By contrast, Inada *et al.* discloses (using his numbering in **bold**) an axially directed sealing "foot portion" **23** for sealable seating against a second poppet valve **30, 31** when the second poppet is biased into the aperture by the second spring **34**. The radial direction of applicants' sealing shoulder *100* enables the inventive valve to have a reduced profile and also provide the advantage of rapid opening, as described at specification page 8, lines 4-10 (published as paragraph [0048], lines 6-14) and illustrated in Figure 22. Nothing in Inada *et al.* would suggest such a modification to their design, or the advantages it provides.

In view of the addition of limitations not previously presented even in dependent claim form, any discussion of the Examiner's position regarding the Bowen, Holowell, and Jones references is thought to be moot and best not discussed so as to avoid complicating prosecution of the currently presented claims.

### Conclusion

Please enter the amendments above and reconsider the application. If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Please note that this paper, and all others filed contemporaneously with it, are filed pursuant to representative capacity as specified in 37 CFR § 1.34, pending formal assignment of ownership of the application and substitution of attorneys, which shall occur at the earliest opportunity and are not expected to impede prosecution on the merits.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Forrest', written over a horizontal line.

Peter Forrest  
Registration No. 33,235  
Attorney for Applicant  
612-632-3067 (voice)  
612-632-4067 (direct fax)  
peter.forrest@gpmlaw.com

September 16, 2005

Gray Plant Mooty Mooty & Bennett, PA  
PO Box 2906  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0906  
GP:1664849 v1

GP:1752407 v1

### **Drawing Amendments**

Please substitute the attached two sheets (each labeled "Replacement Sheet") for Figures 20 and 22 for the respective sheets originally filed. (Figures 1-19 and 21 have been previously amended and accepted.) These Replacement Sheets represent the inadvertently omitted formal drawings in this case, as required by the Examiner's Action of March 21, 2005.